



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,653	02/06/2004	Anil Kamath	111210-134991	7631
25943 7590 01/27/2010 Schwabe Williamson & Wyatt PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900 1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE PORTLAND, OR 97204				
EXAMINER MANSFIELD, THOMAS L				
ART UNIT 3624		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 01/27/2010		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/773,653	KAMATH, ANIL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	THOMAS MANSFIELD	3624	

All Participants:

(1) THOMAS MANSFIELD, Examiner.

(2) R. Fox, R. Barr, A. AuYeung, Applicant's Rep.'s.

Date of Interview: 7 January 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

Claims 1, 7, 8, and 9

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Thomas Mansfield/
Examiner, Art Unit 3624

Status of Application: Non-final rejection

(3) A. Kamath, Applicant.

(4) _____

Time: 2pm EST

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Mansfield initiated an interview to discuss possible amendments to independent Claim 1 to possibly overcome the current cited prior art of record. Mr. Mansfield suggested incorporating the claim limitations of dependent Claims 7 and 8 into Claim 1 to further define the "solving the objective function" limitation. Mr. Mansfield also suggested adding another limitation that refers to dependent Claim 9's "constraints". Additionally, Mr. Mansfield indicated that the last limitation within Claim 1 seems vague and indefinite because the result is not exactly known. No allowable subject matter was discussed or agreed during the interview..